

DO ARBITRAGE-FREE PRICES COME FROM UTILITY MAXIMIZATION?

BY PIETRO SIORPAES

Department of Mathematics, University of Vienna

June 2012

Abstract. In this paper we ask whether arbitrage-free prices are obtained by utility maximization. This is found to be true for any given investor, provided that one considers the marginal utility-based prices relative to *all* initial endowments with finite utility.

1 Introduction

The problem of valuation of a non-traded contingent claim has always been of central importance in mathematical finance. One can distinguish between two fundamentally different notions of price: one inherent to the market, and one dependent on the specific investor. If a security was sold at an ‘unreasonable’ price, an investor could lock in a risk-less profit. Even worse, as long as an investor could be considered infinitesimally small with respect to the size of the market, he could create a ‘money pump’ and make this risk-less profit arbitrarily big. These considerations lead to the fecund concept of *arbitrage-free price*, which prescribes a necessary condition for a market model to be viable.

Fruitful as it was, this notion is of little use to an investor when the mathematical idealization of a complete market falls short of accurately describing reality. Given a non-replicable security, the market mechanism is not sufficient to determine an interval I of ‘threshold’ prices such that *any* agent should buy at a price smaller than every $p \in I$, sell at a price greater than every $p \in I$, and *do nothing at any price* $p \in I$. Since the buying or selling at any arbitrage-free price could lead both to a loss or to a gain, the attitude of the agent towards risk must be taken into consideration to decide what he should do at any such price. The interval of threshold prices should depend on the investor and his initial wealth, and it should be contained in the interval of arbitrage-free prices.

The classical approach in mathematical finance is to assume that the preferences of the agent are determined by the maximal expected utility $u(x, q)$ that he can obtain by investing in the market an initial capital x if holding an endowment consisting of q illiquid contingent claims. Pricing rules derived from $u(x, q)$ are called utility-based, and they form the prevailing paradigm in the valuation of contingent

claims: see for example Davis [Dav97], Frittelli [Fri00], Foldes [Fol00], Hodges and Neuberger [HN89], Karatzas and Kou [KK96], Kallsen [Kal02], Hugonnier, Kramkov and Schachermayer [HKS05], Kramkov and Sirbu [KS06].

We will consider the notion of *marginal (utility-based) price* at (x, q) , which is defined as a price p such that the (utility-maximizing) agent with initial endowment (x, q) if given the opportunity to trade the contingent claim at price p would neither buy nor sell any; so marginal prices are precisely the threshold prices previously mentioned. The idea underlying this valuation principle is well known in economics: see for example Hicks [Hic56].

This paper is concerned with the investigation of whether all arbitrage-free prices are obtained by utility maximization. In other words, is there a ‘bad’ subset of arbitrage-free prices which are never marginal prices, irrespectively of the investor and his endowment, or are all arbitrage-free prices equally ‘realistic’? And if they are, are they simply parameterized by the initial endowment, or does the preference structure of the investor matter, discriminating between which arbitrage-free prices are among his marginal prices and which arise only because of somebody else? To our knowledge these matters have not been previously investigated.

What we find is that arbitrage-free prices always come from utility maximization; moreover, it is enough to consider (any) one agent. This is somewhat surprising, especially considering that, in many occasions, the marginal price at $(x, 0)$ is unique and does not depend on x nor on the utility function (see Karatzas and Kou [KK96]). Of course there is no contradiction because, to recover all arbitrage-free prices, we must consider non-zero random endowments. As we show with an example, the delicate point is that one must not to exclude a priori any initial endowment; this will force us to carefully reconsider the framework of Kramkov and Hugonnier [HK04], on which we rely, and to extend it slightly by including *all* initial endowments with finite utility (not just the ones in the interior).

Another objective is to prove that marginal prices are compatible with the market mechanism; in other words, they never allow for an arbitrage. This is important since a negative answer would seriously undermine the legitimacy of this useful concept of price. Karatzas and Kou [KK96] also study this problem, although in a different setting.

As shown by Hugonnier, Kramkov and Schachermayer [HKS05], under appropriate assumptions, the marginal price at $(x, 0)$ is unique; so if an agent has no initial endowment of illiquid contingent claims, the interval I of threshold prices collapses to a point, a particularly pleasant situation. On the other hand we give a simple example of non-uniqueness of marginal prices, which shows that this phenomenon is not pathological, and on the contrary it is to be expected of prices based at a point on the boundary of the domain of u . This example also shows how, given an arbitrage-free price p , there is no uniqueness of the initial endowment (x, q) that yields p as a marginal price at (x, q) . These two facts show that marginal prices cannot be thought of as a parametrization—nor as a partition—of arbitrage-free prices, with the parameter being the initial endowment. Our example also shows that the set of marginal prices based at a boundary point contains an interval which

has an *arbitrage price* as an end-point (not included in the interval!). We prove that this is always the case, whenever there are any marginal prices based at a boundary point. Finally, we investigate the continuity properties of marginal prices as a multi-function of the initial endowment, both at points inside and on the boundary of the domain of u .

2 The model

In this section we introduce the model of an agent investing in a financial market which will be our framework. This is essentially the same as in [HK04], although we have to consider slightly more general random endowments, or our main result would not hold (see Section 4).

Consider a model of a financial market composed of a savings account and d stocks which can be traded continuously in time. As is common in mathematical finance, we consider a finite time horizon $[0, T]$, and we assume that the interest rate is 0; that is, the price process of the savings account is used as numéraire and is thus normalized to one. The price process $S = (S^i)_{i=1}^d$ of the stocks is assumed to be a semi-martingale on a given filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$, where the filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ satisfies the usual conditions.

A (self-financing) portfolio is then defined as a pair (x, H) , where the constant x represents the initial capital and the random variable H_t^i specifies the number of shares of stock i held in the portfolio at time t . The wealth process X of such a portfolio evolves in time as the stochastic integral of H with respect to S :

$$X_t = x + (H \cdot S)_t = x + \int_0^t H_u dS_u, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where H is assumed to be a predictable S -integrable process.

For $x \geq 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{X}(x)$ the set of non-negative wealth processes whose initial value is equal to x , that is,

$$\mathcal{X}(x) := \{X \geq 0 : X_t = x + (H \cdot S)_t\}.$$

A probability measure Q is called an equivalent local martingale measure if it is equivalent to P and if every $X \in \mathcal{X}(1)$ is a local martingale under Q . We remark that the results in [KS99], [KS03], [HK04], [DS97] on which our proofs hinge, although proved for a locally bounded semi-martingale and with a definition of martingale measure specialized to that case, are true also without the local-boundedness assumption if one takes the previous definition of martingale measure.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the family of equivalent local martingale measures, and we assume that

$$\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset. \tag{1}$$

This condition is essentially equivalent to the absence of arbitrage opportunities in the market without the European contingent claims; see [DS94] and [DS98] for precise statements as well as for further references.

In our model we also consider an economic agent whose preferences over terminal consumption bundles are represented by a utility function U . The function U is assumed to be strictly concave, strictly increasing and continuously differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ and to satisfy Inada conditions:

$$U'(0+) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0+} U'(x) = \infty, \quad U'(\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} U'(x) = 0. \quad (2)$$

It will be convenient to consider U as defined on the whole real line. We want its extension to be concave and upper semi-continuous, and (2) implies that there is only one possible choice: we define $U(x)$ to be $-\infty$ for x in $(-\infty, 0)$, and to equal $U(0+)$ at $x = 0$.

In this paper we will be concerned with a family of non-traded European contingent claims and their prices. We denote by $f = (f_j)_{j=1}^n$ the vector of the $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable payment functions of the European contingent claims with maturity T . We assume that the European contingent claims are dominated by the final value of a non-negative wealth process X' , that is,

$$|f| := \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^2} \leq X'_T. \quad (3)$$

For equivalent conditions see [HK04, lemma 1].

To rule out doubling strategies in the model, one has to impose some sort of boundedness condition on the allowed wealth processes. A natural guess, following [DS94], would be to consider the set of admissible strategies, i.e., those whose wealth processes are uniformly bounded from below. However, if we want the expected utility relative to some wealth process X to be bigger than $-\infty$, then X must have a non-negative *final* value X_T ; if X is admissible, (1) then implies that X must be non-negative at all times. It follows that, in the problem of optimal investment with a utility function defined on the positive real line, one should take the set of non-negative wealth processes $\mathcal{X}(x)$ to be the feasible set. In the presence of additional contingent claims however, the feasible set should be extended.

A non-negative wealth process in $\mathcal{X}(x)$ is said to be maximal if its terminal value cannot be dominated by that of any other process in $\mathcal{X}(x)$. We recall that the set of positive maximal wealth processes coincides with the set of ‘good’ numéraires in the model (see [DS95]). Since given a wealth process $X \in \mathcal{X}(x)$ one can always find a maximal wealth process $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}(x)$ such that $X_T \leq \tilde{X}_T$ (see [DS94]), condition (3) is equivalent to saying that $|f|$ is bounded with respect to some numéraire. Thus the natural optimization set when the contingent claims f are assumed to satisfy (3) is the set of wealth processes that are admissible under some numéraire. These can be characterized as follows.

We say that a wealth process X is *acceptable* if it admits a representation of the form $X = X' - X''$, where X' is a non-negative wealth process and X'' is a maximal wealth process. Note that if the maximal process $1 + X''$ is chosen as a numéraire, then the discounted process $X/(1 + X'')$ is uniformly bounded from below and hence

is admissible under this numéraire. Vice versa if X is admissible under a numéraire N , i.e., if X/N is uniformly bounded below by some negative constant c for some positive maximal wealth process N , then the representation $X = X' - X''$ with $X' = X - cN$, $X'' = -cN$, shows that X is acceptable. For a detailed discussion of maximal and acceptable processes, we refer the reader to [DS97].

Consider an agent with an initial endowment consisting of a cash amount x and a quantity q of European contingent claims f which expire at maturity T . The q contingent claims f have payoff

$$qf := \sum_{j=1}^n q_j f_j$$

(throughout this paper we will use the notation vw for the dot product of the vectors v and w). Thus, if the agent was to follow the strategy H , his wealth process would be $X = x + H \cdot S$ and his final wealth $X_T + qf$. If the contingent claims f cannot be traded and all the agent can do is to invest in the stocks and the bond according to some dynamic strategy, then his maximal expected utility will be

$$u(x, q) = \sup_{\{X: X \text{ is acceptable}, X_0=x\}} \mathbb{E}[U(X_T + qf)], \quad (4)$$

where we define $\mathbb{E}[U(X_T + qf)]$ to be $-\infty$ when $\mathbb{E}[U^-(X_T + qf)] = -\infty$, whether or not $\mathbb{E}[U^+(X_T + qf)]$ is finite. Clearly, if the wealth process does not satisfy $X_T + qf \geq 0$ then the corresponding expected utility will be $-\infty$. With this in mind and following [HK04], we define $\mathcal{X}(x, q)$ to be the set of acceptable wealth processes with initial value x whose terminal value dominates the random payoff $-qf$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{X}(x, q) := \{X : X \text{ is acceptable}, X_0 = x \text{ and } X_T + qf \geq 0\}.$$

Of course this set can be empty for some values of (x, q) . In the case when $x \geq 0$ and $q = 0$, this set coincides with the set of non-negative wealth processes with initial value x ; in other words, we have $\mathcal{X}(x, 0) = \mathcal{X}(x)$ for all $x \geq 0$.

We will consider the convex cone $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ consisting of the points (x, q) where $\mathcal{X}(x, q)$ is not empty, i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}} := \{(x, q) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{X}(x, q) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (5)$$

As shown in [HK04], under assumption (3) $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ is closed and its interior $\mathcal{K}$ contains $(x, 0)$ for any $x > 0$. Being convex, $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ is then the closure of $\mathcal{K}$.

We point out that, if conditions (1), (2), and (3) hold and $u(x, 0) < \infty$ for some $x > 0$, then the concave function u defined on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by (4) never takes the value ∞ and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{u > -\infty\} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, where the inclusions are generally strict (as simple examples, built along the lines of the one in Section 4, can show). In particular $\mathcal{K}$ is the interior of $\{u > -\infty\}$, and $-u$ is a proper convex function.

Suppose now that it becomes possible to trade the contingent claims *at time* 0 and at price p . Consider an agent with random endowment (x, q) who buys q' contingent claims, spending $q'p := \sum_{j=1}^n q'_j p_j$. If he then invests the remaining

wealth $x - q'p$ dynamically into the stocks and bond following the strategy H , his wealth process will be $X = x - q'p + (H \cdot S)$ and his final wealth will be $X_T + (q + q')f$.

If we want to rule out arbitrage possibilities in the expanded market we have to require that an agent with zero initial endowment and non-negative final wealth must have zero final wealth. So, we will say that p is an *arbitrage-free price* for the European contingent claims f if, for any $q' \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $X \in \mathcal{X}(-pq', q')$ implies $X_T + q'f = 0$.

Consider now an agent with utility U and with corresponding maximal expected utility u given by (4), and fix a point (x, q) in $\{u > -\infty\}$. We will say that p is a *marginal utility-based price* at (x, q) for f relative to U if the (utility-maximizing) agent with initial endowment (x, q) given the opportunity to trade the contingent claims f at time zero at price p would neither buy nor sell any. Since the agent with initial endowment (x, q) who buys a quantity q' of contingent claims and then invests optimally into the stocks and bond will obtain an expected utility $u(x - q'p, q + q')$, the previous definition can be stated equivalently as: p is a marginal utility-based price at (x, q) if

$$u(x - q'p, q + q') \leq u(x, q) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for all } q' \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (6)$$

Intuition suggests that in the previous definition we exclude a priori the points (x, q) in $\{u = -\infty\}$; our main result will show that indeed this is a good choice.

We will denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the set of arbitrage-free prices of f , and by $\mathcal{P}(x, q; U)$ the set of marginal utility-based prices of f at (x, q) relative to the utility function U .

We will see in Corollary 8 how exactly $\mathcal{P}(x, q; U)$ relates to the super-differential of u .

3 Statement of the main theorem

Our objective is to answer to the following questions:

1. Can one span all arbitrage-free prices using marginal utility-based prices? In particular, does one need to consider the marginal utility-based prices at all points (x, q) in $\{u > -\infty\}$, or is it enough to consider the ‘nicer’ points in the interior? Does one have to take the prices relative to all possible utilities, or to some subfamily, or is it enough to consider any one utility function?
2. It is true that all marginal utility-based prices are arbitrage-free prices?

In order to state our main result we need to introduce some more standard notation. We will denote by $\mathcal{Y}(y)$ the family of non-negative processes Y with initial value y and such that for any non-negative wealth process X the product XY is a super-martingale, that is,

$$\mathcal{Y}(y) := \{Y \geq 0 : Y_0 = y, XY \text{ is a super-martingale for all } X \in \mathcal{X}(1)\}. \quad (7)$$

In particular, as $\mathcal{X}(1)$ contains the constant process 1, the elements of $\mathcal{Y}(y)$ are non-negative super-martingales. Note also that the set $\mathcal{Y}(1)$ contains the density processes of all $Q \in \mathcal{M}$.

The convex conjugate function V of the agent's utility function U is defined to be the Fenchel-Legendre transform of the function $-U(-\cdot)$; that is,

$$V(y) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (U(x) - xy) = \sup_{x > 0} (U(x) - xy), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (8)$$

It is well known that, under the Inada conditions (2), the conjugate of U is convex and lower semi-continuous, and on $(0, \infty)$ it is a continuously differentiable, strictly decreasing and strictly convex function satisfying $V'(0+) = -\infty$, $V'(\infty) = 0$, $V(0) = V(0+) = U(\infty)$, $V(\infty) = U(0)$. Moreover $V(y) = -\infty$ if $y < 0$ and the following bi-dual relation holds:

$$U(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} (V(y) + xy) = \inf_{y > 0} (V(y) + xy), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Following [HK04], we will denote by w the value function of the problem of optimal investment without the European contingent claims, and by $\tilde{w}$ its dual value function. In other words

$$w(x) := \sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}(x)} \mathbb{E}[U(X_T)], \quad \tilde{w}(y) := \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}(y)} \mathbb{E}[V(Y_T)]. \quad (9)$$

The following theorem constitutes our main result.

Theorem 1 *Assume that conditions (1), (2) and (3) hold and that*

$$\tilde{w}(y) < \infty \text{ for all } y > 0,$$

where $\tilde{w}$ is the function defined by (7), (8), (9). Then the set of arbitrage-free prices coincides with the set of all marginal utility-based prices relative to the utility function U . In other words

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{(x,q) \in \{u > -\infty\}} \mathcal{P}(x, q; U), \quad (10)$$

where u is the function defined in (4).

A few remarks are in order.

1. The previous theorem says in particular that to recover all arbitrage-free prices there is no need to consider all possible utilities: any one utility function will do!
2. We will see in Section 4 that, to obtain a result like the above, it is *not* sufficient to consider the points (x, q) in the interior $\mathcal{K}$ of $\{u > -\infty\}$; this is why we are forced to extend the framework of [HK04].

However, as showed in Section 8, it is enough to consider sets considerably smaller than $\{u > -\infty\}$.

The plan of the rest of the paper is as follows: in Section 4 we show with an explicit example what can go wrong, in Section 5 we present a useful characterization of arbitrage-free prices, in Section 6 we obtain that the maximal expected utility function $u(x, q)$ is upper semi-continuous, in Section 7 we prove our main theorem and in Section 8 we derive a simple formula for marginal utility-based prices, we sharpen our main theorem, we investigate the continuity properties of marginal prices as a multi-function of the initial endowment, and we show that the set of marginal prices based at a boundary point either is empty or it contains an interval which has an *arbitrage price* as an end-point (not included in the interval!).

4 An illuminating example

We will now construct explicitly an illuminating example which proves the second remark after Theorem 1, and illustrates a number of intuitive statements about marginal prices fail to be true.

We will denote by $(1, p)^\perp$ the set of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ orthogonal to $(1, p)$. Given any non-negative number x and the set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ defined in (5), if we define

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x) := \bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap \{(x - qp, q) : q \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad (11)$$

then $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ is the set of points $(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ whose dot product with $(1, p)$ equals x , i.e., the intersection of $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and the set $(x, 0) + (1, p)^\perp$. Since $u = -\infty$ outside $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, it follows from the definition of marginal prices (6) that p is a *marginal price* at $(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ if and only if (a, b) is a *maximizer* of u on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$.

Let us now build an example of the following counter-intuitive situation: an arbitrage-free price p and a maximal expected utility function u that, when restricted to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$, attains its maximum *only* at some point (x', q') on the boundary of $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$. This will give that p belongs to $\mathcal{P}(x', q')$ but not to any $\mathcal{P}(\bar{x}, \bar{q})$ with $(\bar{x}, \bar{q})$ in $\mathcal{K}$.

Take $U(x) = \sqrt{x}$, and consider a market with no stocks and one contingent claim whose law has density

$$c(s+1)^{\frac{3}{2}} 1_{[-1,1]}(s)$$

with respect to the Lebesgue measure, where c is the normalization constant. In this case $\bar{\mathcal{K}} = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |b| \leq a\}$, and trivially $(-1, 1)$ is the set of arbitrage-free prices $\mathcal{P}$. Fix $p = 0$ and $x > 0$, then $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x) = \{x\} \times [-x, x]$ and we want to prove that the concave function

$$h(q) := u(x, q) = c \int_{-1}^1 \sqrt{x+qs} (s+1)^{\frac{3}{2}} ds, \quad q \in [-x, x],$$

does not attain a maximum at any point in the interior (x, x) of $[x, x]$. By differentiating under the integral we compute the derivative of h to be

$$h'(q) = c \int_{-1}^1 \frac{s(s+1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2\sqrt{x+qs}} ds.$$

The function h is concave, so its derivative is non-increasing. It follows that since

$$h'(x) = \frac{c}{2\sqrt{x}} \int_{-1}^1 s(s+1)ds = \frac{c}{3\sqrt{x}}$$

is strictly positive, h is strictly increasing on $[-x, x]$, so its maximum is attained only at $q = x$. Thus $p = 0 \in \mathcal{P}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}(x, x)$ (for any $x > 0$) but not to any $\mathcal{P}(\bar{x}, \bar{q})$ with $(\bar{x}, \bar{q})$ in $\mathcal{K}$, proving the second remark after Theorem 1.

This example also illustrates how the uniqueness of marginal utility-based prices fails on the boundary; let us show that indeed $(-1, 0) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(x, x)$. If $-1 < r < 0$ we have that (draw a picture!)

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}}^r(x(1+r)) = \{(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}} : a + br = x(1+r)\} \subseteq \{(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}} : a \leq x\}. \quad (12)$$

Since $[0, \infty) \ni \lambda \mapsto u((\lambda x, \lambda q))$ is non-decreasing, the maximum of u on the set $\{(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}} : a \leq x\}$ is attained on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x) = \{x\} \times [-x, x]$, and then we know it is attained at the point (x, x) . Then (12) implies that (x, x) is a maximizer of u on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^r(x(1+r))$, i.e., $r \in \mathcal{P}(x, x)$.

In this example $\mathcal{P}(x, x)$ not only is not a singleton: it even contains a whole open interval of prices with one extreme being an arbitrage price. As Theorem 9 will show, this is a general fact.

The inclusion $(-1, 0] \subseteq \mathcal{P}(x, x)$, valid for all $x > 0$, also shows that the same marginal price can correspond to multiple initial endowments. So marginal prices cannot be thought of as a parametrization—nor as a partition—of arbitrage-free prices, with the parameter being the initial endowment.

Observe how this example yields a function u which is finite and continuous on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$. While this is not true in general, we will see that u is always upper semi-continuous.

5 Characterizations of Arbitrage-Free Prices

Following [DS97], we will say that a wealth process X is *workable* if both X and $-X$ are acceptable. We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *Assume condition (1). Then given any $X \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$ there exists a workable $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$ such that $\tilde{X}_T \geq X_T$.*

PROOF. Define the set

$$\mathcal{C}(x) := \{g \in L_+^0(P) : g \leq X_T \text{ for some } X \in \mathcal{X}(x)\},$$

which is closed and bounded in $L^0(P)$ (see [KS99, Proposition 3.1]). Let $X = X' - X''$ be a decomposition of the acceptable process $X \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$ into a nonnegative wealth process X' and a maximal process X'' , and define

$$B := \mathcal{C}(x) \cap \{g \in L^0(P) : g \geq X'_T\}.$$

The set B is then closed and bounded in $L^0(P)$ and so, as stated and proved in the course of the proof of lemma 4.3 in [DS94], B contains a maximal element $\tilde{g}$. It follows that there exists a maximal $\tilde{X}' \in \mathcal{X}(x)$ such that $\tilde{X}'_T = \tilde{g} \geq X'_T$. Take $\tilde{X} := \tilde{X}' - X''$, then $\tilde{X}$ is workable and $\tilde{X}_T \geq X_T$, so $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$. $\square$

Following [HKS05] we will say that a random variable g is *replicable* if there is an workable process X such that $X_T = g$. Provided that it exists, such a process X is unique. At times we will need to assume that

$$\text{for any non-zero } q \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ the random variable } qf \text{ is not replicable,} \quad (13)$$

which, as explained in [HK04, Remark 6], can typically be done without loss of generality (depending on the issue at hand). We will denote by $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ the polar of $-\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} := -\bar{\mathcal{K}}^\circ := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : vw \geq 0 \text{ for all } w \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}\}. \quad (14)$$

Clearly, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is a closed convex cone; we will denote its relative interior by $\mathcal{L}$.

As shown in [HK04, Lemma 7], assumptions (1), (3) and (13) imply that the interior of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is nonempty, i.e., it equals $\mathcal{L}$. It follows that in this case $\mathcal{L}$ is the set of points $(y, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $xy + qr > 0$ for every non-zero $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$. If (13) is not assumed, $\mathcal{L}$ can be analogously characterized using its affine hull, which is $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ and is the orthogonal complement to $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (-\bar{\mathcal{K}})$. Indeed since $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ is a closed convex cone (see [HK04, Lemma 6]), it follows immediately from (14) and the definition of relative interior that $\mathcal{L}$ is the set of points (y, r) in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ (or in $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$) such that $xy + qr > 0$ for every non-zero $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ which belongs to the affine hull $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$. These facts will be used in the proof of the following lemma, which is of crucial importance.

Lemma 3 *Assume conditions (1) and (3). Then the following are equivalent:*

1. p is an arbitrage-free price.
2. $(1, p) \in \mathcal{L}$.
3. There exists an equivalent local martingale measure $Q \in \mathcal{M}$ that satisfies $\mathbb{E}_Q[f] = p$ and such that the maximal process X' that appears in (3) is a uniformly integrable martingale under Q .

Moreover, given an arbitrary $x \geq 0$, $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (1, p)^\perp$ is the recession cone of the set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ defined in (11), and if condition (13) holds then p is an arbitrage-free price if and only if $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ is bounded.

The previous lemma shows that item 3, which would have been a plausible alternative definition of arbitrage-free price, is actually equivalent to our definition. Moreover it provides other equivalent conditions which, due to their clear geometrical interpretation, will prove very useful.

One could also prove that

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (1, p)^\perp \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (-\bar{\mathcal{K}}) \quad (15)$$

is a fourth equivalent condition, but we will not need this result.

PROOF. That item 2 implies item 3 is part of [HK04, Lemma 8]. Trivially item 3 implies item 1. Now let us prove that item 1 implies item 2. Let p be an arbitrage-free price and assume that $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and $x + pq \leq 0$, let $X \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$, $X = x + H \cdot S$ and define $X' := -qp + H \cdot S$. Then $X'_T + qf$ is the sum of the two non-negative quantities $-qp - x$ and $X_T + qf$. It follows that X' belongs to $\mathcal{X}(-qp, q)$, and so by no arbitrage $X'_T + qf = 0$, which implies $x + qp = 0$ and $X_T + qf = 0$. This proves that if $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ then $x + qp \geq 0$ (so $(1, p) \in -\bar{\mathcal{K}}^o = \bar{\mathcal{L}}$), and that if $x + qp = 0$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$ then $X_T + qf = 0$; since, we can assume that such an X is workable (thanks to lemma 2), it follows that if $x + qp = 0$ then $-X \in \mathcal{X}(-x, -q)$, proving that if (x, q) is in $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and is orthogonal to $(1, p)$ then (x, q) belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (-\bar{\mathcal{K}})$, the orthogonal complement of the affine hull of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$. Thus the only vector $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ that is orthogonal to $(1, p)$ and belongs to the affine hull of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is the zero vector, so $(1, p)$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}$.

It is trivial that $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (1, p)^\perp$ is contained in the recession cone of $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$. For the opposite inclusion assume that (a, b) belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ and (c, d) belongs to its recession cone, then for any n , $(a, b) + n(c, d)$ belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$, so (c, d) is orthogonal to $(1, p)$ and $(c, d) = \lim_n (a + nc, b + nd)/n \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$.

We will now use that a closed and convex set is unbounded if and only if its recession cone contains a non-zero element (see [Roc70, Theorem 8.4]).

If $(1, p)$ does not belong to $\mathcal{L}$ there exists a non-zero $(x', q') \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ such that $x' + pq' \leq 0$, and up to replacing (x', q') with a convex combination of (x', q') with $(1, 0)$ we can assume that $x' + pq' = 0$, and so the non-zero vector (x', q') belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (1, p)^\perp$. This proves that if $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ is bounded then p is an arbitrage-free price. Vice versa if $(1, p)$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}$ then $xy + qr > 0$ for every non-zero $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, and so $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (1, p)^\perp = \{0\}$, proving that $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ is bounded. $\square$

6 Upper semicontinuity of u

Given an arbitrary vector $(y, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we denote by $\mathcal{Y}(y, r)$ the set of non-negative super-martingales $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(y)$ such that the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_T(X_T + qf)] \leq xy + qr \quad (16)$$

holds true whenever $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)$. Clearly this set will be empty if $(y, r) \notin \bar{\mathcal{L}}$, and it coincides with the set defined in [HK04] since asking that (16) holds for all $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ is equivalent to asking that it holds for all $(x, q) \in \mathcal{K}$. Let $\mathcal{D}(y, r)$ be the set of the positive random variables dominated by the final value of

some element of $\mathcal{Y}(y, r)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}(y, r) := \{h \in L_+^0 : h \leq Y_T \text{ for some } Y \in \mathcal{Y}(y, r)\}, \quad (17)$$

and define

$$\mathcal{C}(x, q) := \{g \in L_+^0 : g \leq X_T + qf \text{ for some } X \in \mathcal{X}(x, q)\}. \quad (18)$$

Analogously we define, following [KS99],

$$\mathcal{D}(y) := \{h \in L_+^0 : h \leq Y_T \text{ for some } Y \in \mathcal{Y}(y)\}, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}(x) := \{g \in L_+^0 : g \leq X_T \text{ for some } X \in \mathcal{X}(x)\}. \quad (20)$$

Given two sequences of functions $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we will say that $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a *forward convex combination* of $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$ if, for every n , f_n is a (finite) convex combination of $(g_k)_{k \geq n}$.

Lemma 4 *Assume that conditions (1) and (3) hold. Let $g_n \in \mathcal{C}(x_n, q_n)$ for some sequence (x_n, q_n) converging to (x, q) . If a forward convex combination of $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges almost surely to a random variable g , then $g \in \mathcal{C}(x, q)$. Analogously if a forward convex combination of $h_n \in \mathcal{D}(y_n, r_n)$ is converging almost surely to h and $(y_n, r_n) \rightarrow (y, r)$, then $h \in \mathcal{D}(y, r)$.*

PROOF. The first statement follows applying Fatou's lemma to the converging forward convex combination of $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$ to obtain $\mathbb{E}[gh] \leq xy + qr$ for all $(y, r) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ and $h \in \mathcal{D}(y, r)$, so that $g \in \mathcal{C}(x, q)$ follows from [HK04, Proposition 1], item 1 (which, even if stated only for $(x, q) \in \mathcal{K}$, is actually valid with the same proof for any $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$). The proof of the second statement is analogous. $\square$

Remark 5 *Assume that conditions (1) and (3) hold. Then $\mathcal{Y}(y, r) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $(y, r) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$.*

PROOF. One implication is trivial. For the vice versa, observe first that $\mathcal{D}(y, r)$ is not empty if $(y, r) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$, as this follows from [HK04, Lemmas 8 and 9]. If (y, r) is an arbitrary point in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ then take $(y_n, r_n) \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $(y_n, r_n) \rightarrow (y, r)$ and choose $h_n \in \mathcal{D}(y_n, r_n) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\sup_n y_n)$. We can then apply Kolmos' lemma to find a forward convex combination of $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converging to some random variable h , and apply Lemma 4 to show that $h \in \mathcal{D}(y, r)$. $\square$

The following theorem allows us to control the behavior of the maximal expected utility function u on the boundary of its domain.

Theorem 6 *Under the assumption of Theorem 1 the function $u : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ is upper semi-continuous and for all $(x, q) \in \{u > -\infty\}$ there exists a unique maximizer to (4).*

PROOF. To prove that u is upper semi-continuous let (x^k, q^k) be a sequence converging to (x, q) , assume without loss of generality that $u(x^k, q^k) > -\infty$ and take $X^k \in \mathcal{X}(x^k, q^k)$ such that $u(x^k, q^k) - 1/k \leq \mathbb{E}[U(X_T^k + q^k f)]$. Define $g^k := X_T^k + q^k f$ and $s := \limsup_k u(x^k, q^k)$. Passing to a subsequence without re-labelling we can assume that $u(x^k, q^k)$ converges to s , and so

$$s = \lim_m \left(\inf_{k \geq m} u(x^k, q^k) - 1/k \right) \leq \lim_m \left(\inf_{k \geq m} \mathbb{E}[U(g^k)] \right). \quad (21)$$

If x'_0 is the initial value of the process X' appearing in (3) and $\bar{x}$ is the supremum of the bounded sequence

$$(x^k + x'_0 \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |q_j^k|)_{k \geq 1},$$

then assumption (3) implies that, for every m , $g^m \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{x})$.

We can then apply Kolmos' lemma to find a forward convex combination $(\tilde{g}^k)_{k \geq 1}$ of $(g^k)_{k \geq 1}$ which is converging almost surely to some random variable g . Then Lemma 4 gives that $g \in \mathcal{C}(x, q)$, and Jensen inequality yields

$$\inf_{k \geq m} \mathbb{E}[U(g^k)] \leq \mathbb{E}[U(\tilde{g}^m)]. \quad (22)$$

Since $(\tilde{g}^m)_{m \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\bar{x})$, it follows from [KS03, Lemma 1] that $(U(\tilde{g}^m)^+)_{m \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable, so Fatou's lemma and inequalities (21) and (22) imply that

$$\limsup_k u(x^k, q^k) = s \leq \limsup_m \mathbb{E}[U(\tilde{g}^m)] \leq \mathbb{E}[U(g)] \leq u(x, q), \quad (23)$$

which says that u is upper semi-continuous. If $u(x, q) > -\infty$ then one can take $(x^k, q^k) = (x, q)$ in the above, and so (23) gives that there exists a maximizer to (4). Uniqueness follows from the strict concavity of U . $\square$

7 Proof of the main theorem

We will repeatedly need the following simple observation.

Lemma 7 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, if (13) holds, $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) \in \{u > -\infty\}$, and $(x, q) \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}} \setminus \{0\}$, then $u(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) < u(\tilde{x} + x, \tilde{q} + q)$.*

PROOF Theorem 6 yields the existence of a maximizer $X(x, q)$ to (4), and [HK04, Lemma 7] provides the existence of a $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q})$ such that $P(\tilde{X}_T + \tilde{q}f > 0) > 0$. Thus the following inequality holds

$$U(X_T(x, q) + \tilde{X}_T + (q + \tilde{q})f) \geq U(X_T(x, q) + qf), \quad (24)$$

and it is a strict inequality with strictly positive probability. The thesis follows integrating the two sides of (24), since the right hand side is integrable and has integral

$u(x, q)$, and the left hand side has integral at most $u(\tilde{x} + x, \tilde{q} + q)$. $\square$

In the next proof we will use without further mention that a closed and convex set is unbounded if and only if its recession cone contains a non-zero element (see [Roc70, Theorem 8.4]).

PROOF. OF THEOREM 1 Let p be an arbitrage-free price and take an $x > 0$. As explained in [HK04, Remark 6], without loss of generality we can assume condition (13). Thus, Lemma 3 gives that the set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ is bounded. Since [HK04, Lemma 6] gives that $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ is closed, the function u , which is upper semi-continuous (Theorem 6), when restricted to the compact set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$ attains its maximum at some point $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q})$, so that $p \in \mathcal{P}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q})$. The inclusion

$$\mathcal{P} \subseteq \bigcup_{(x,q) \in \{u > -\infty\}} \mathcal{P}(x, q; U)$$

now follows from $u(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q}) \geq u(x, 0) > -\infty$.

Vice versa let $a > 0$ and assume that p is not an arbitrage-free price and that $u(x, q) \in \mathbb{R}$ for an $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(a)$, and let's prove that (x, q) is not a maximizer of u on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(a)$, so that $p \notin \mathcal{P}(x, q)$. By Lemma 3 there exists a non-zero $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{q})$ in $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \cap (1, p)^\perp$, the recession cone of $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(a)$. Since we can assume condition (13) without loss of generality, we can apply Lemma 7. It follows that $u(x + \tilde{x}, q + \tilde{q}) > u(x, q)$ and so, since $(x + \tilde{x}, q + \tilde{q})$ belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(a)$, (x, q) is not a maximizer of u on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(a)$. $\square$

8 Consequences and related results

It is interesting, and perhaps counter-intuitive, that to span all arbitrage-free prices using marginal utility-based prices it is not enough in general to use the interior of $\{u > -\infty\}$ (as showed in Section 4). This warrants the study of $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ in the case where (x, q) belongs to the boundary of $\{u > -\infty\}$; in particular we ask which properties that hold in the case where (x, q) belongs to the interior $\mathcal{K}$ of $\{u > -\infty\}$ are still true when (x, q) belongs to the boundary $\partial\mathcal{K} = \partial\{u > -\infty\}$.

First of all, if (x, q) belongs to the interior of $\{u > -\infty\}$, $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ is never empty, it is a singleton if and only if u is differentiable at (x, q) , and can be 'computed' using the super-differential $\partial u(x, q)$ (as mentioned in [HK04]). If (x, q) belongs to the boundary of $\{u > -\infty\}$, $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ can be empty and, if it is not, it is never a singleton. Indeed the following corollary of Theorem 1 specifies for which points (x, q) the set $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ is empty, and allows us to 'compute it' in the same way as if (x, q) belonged to the interior of $\{u > -\infty\}$; Theorem 9 then implies that $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ is never a singleton.

Corollary 8 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, if (13) holds then $\mathcal{P}(x, q; U)$ is non-empty if and only if $\partial u(x, q)$ is non-empty. If $(y, r) \in \partial u(x, q)$ then $y > 0$, and*

$$\mathcal{P}(x, q; U) = \left\{ \frac{r}{y} : (y, r) \in \partial u(x, q) \right\}. \quad (25)$$

PROOF. Given $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ consider the linear function $A_p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ given by $A_p(q') := (-q'p, q')$ and its adjoint A_p^* given by $A_p^*(y, r) = r - yp$. Now fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and consider the proper concave function f_p given by $f_p(q') = u((x, q) + A_p(q'))$, so that by definition p is a marginal price at (x, q) if and only if 0 is a maximizer of f_p , i.e., iff $0 \in \partial f_p(0)$

If $(y, r) \in \partial u(x, q)$ then $y > 0$, since $f(t) := u(t, q)$ is strictly increasing on $[x, \infty)$ (by Lemma 7) and $y \in \partial f(0)$. We can then define $p = r/y$ and [Roc70, Theorem 23.9] implies that

$$0 \in A_p^*(\partial u(x, q)) \subseteq \partial f_p(0),$$

, i.e., $p \in \mathcal{P}(x, q)$.

For the opposite inclusion assume $p \in \mathcal{P}(x, q)$, so that by definition $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and, by Theorem 1 and Lemma 3, $(1, p)$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}$. As explained after (14), it follows that $y := x + qp > 0$, and so [HK04, Lemma 1] implies that

$$(x, q) + A_p(-q) = (y, 0) \in \mathcal{K},$$

and now another application of [Roc70, Theorem 23.9] yields

$$A_p^*(\partial u(x, q)) = \partial f_p(0) \ni 0,$$

, i.e., $r - py = 0$ for some $(y, r) \in \partial u(x, q)$. $\square$

A simple consequence of Corollary 8 is that $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ is a compact set if (x, q) belongs to $\mathcal{K}$; and more generally if C is a compact subset of $\mathcal{K}$ then

$$\bigcup_{(x, q) \in C} \mathcal{P}(x, q) \quad (26)$$

is a compact subset of $\mathcal{P}$ (this follows from the fact that $\partial u(C)$ is compact: see [Ber03, Proposition 4.4.2]). This contrasts strongly with the following surprising theorem, where by $[p_0, p)$ we denote the segment from p_0 to p , excluding p .

Theorem 9 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, if (13) holds and $p_0 \in \mathcal{P}(x, q)$ for some non-zero (x, q) on the boundary of $\{u > -\infty\}$, then there exists an arbitrage price $p \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{P}$ such that $[p_0, p) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(x, q)$.*

PROOF The convex closed set $\partial u(x, q)$ is unbounded (see [Roc70, Theorem 23.4]), so its recession cone contains a non-zero element (y, r) (see [Roc70, Theorem 8.4]). By Corollary 8 there exists a $(y_0, r_0) \in \partial u(x, q)$. Let $t \geq 0$, then by definition

$$(y_t, r_t) := (y_0, r_0) + t(y, r) \in \partial u(x, q), \quad (27)$$

and then Corollary 8 implies that $v_t := r_t/y_t \in \mathcal{P}(x, q)$. Let $p := r/y$. It is easy to see that the set $\{v_t : t \geq 0\}$ is convex, and that it equals the segment $[p_0, p)$ (see [BV04, Section 2.3.3]). We now only need to prove that p is not an arbitrage-free price. From (27) it follows that, for every (a, b) in $\{u > -\infty\}$,

$$u(a, b) \leq u(x, q) + (y_t, r_t)((a, b) - (x, q)).$$

Dividing times t and taking the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ yields that

$$0 \leq (y, r)((a, b) - (x, q)),$$

and then choosing $(a, b) = (x/2, q/2) + \varepsilon(1, 0) \in \mathcal{K}$ we get that $(y, r)(x, q) \leq 2\varepsilon y$.

Sending ε to zero we obtain $(y, r)(x, q) \leq 0$, which implies that (y, r) does not belong to $\mathcal{L}$. Lemma 3 concludes the proof. $\square$

Let us now study the continuity properties of $(x, q) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(x, q)$.

Theorem 10 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, if $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \ni (x_k, q_k) \rightarrow (x, q)$ and $\mathcal{P}(x_k, q_k) \ni p_k \rightarrow p$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and (13) holds, then either*

$$x + qp > 0 \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{P}(x, q) \subseteq \mathcal{P},$$

or $x + qp = 0$, in which case $(x, q) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$ and, if $(x, q) \neq 0$, $p \notin \mathcal{P}$.

PROOF Assume first that $x + pq = 0$. If $w \in \mathcal{K}$ and $v \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \setminus \{0\}$ then $wv > 0$; thus Lemma 3 implies that (x, q) belongs to $\partial\mathcal{K}$. Moreover if $w \in \bar{\mathcal{K}} \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \mathcal{L}$ then $wv > 0$; thus, if $(x, q) \neq 0$, $p \notin \mathcal{P}$. Now assume instead that $x + pq > 0$; then, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, $(x + qp - \varepsilon, 0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{K}$. Thus, if $(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}^{\mathcal{P}}(x)$, also

$$(a_n, b_n) := \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)(a, b) + \frac{1}{n}(x + qp - \varepsilon, 0)$$

belongs to $\mathcal{K}$, and $a_n + b_n p < a + bp = x + qp$. It follows that, for big enough k , $a_n + b_n p_k < x_k + q_k p_k$; since $p_k \in \mathcal{P}(x_k, q_k)$, this implies that $u(a_n, b_n) \leq u(x_k, q_k)$, and in particular $u(a_n, b_n) \leq \limsup_k u(x_k, q_k) \leq u(x, q)$. Since $u(a_n, b_n)$ converges to $u(a, b)$ (see [Roc70, Corollary 7.5.1]), this proves $u(a, b) \leq u(x, q)$, so $p \in \mathcal{P}(x, q)$. $\square$

Note that, in the situation described in Theorem 9, $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ is generally not closed (as one can easily show with the example in Section 4); however Theorem 10 says that $\mathcal{P}(x, q)$ contains all its accumulation points which are not outside $\mathcal{P}$.

The following two extreme cases merit special mention. If we take (x_k, q_k) to be converging to a non-zero (x, q) such that $\partial u(x, q)$ is empty, then any converging sequence $p_k \in \mathcal{P}(x_k, q_k)$ must be converging to an arbitrage price. If instead in Theorem 10 we take (x_k, q_k) to be converging to a $(x, q) \in \mathcal{K}$, then any converging sequence $p_k \in \mathcal{P}(x_k, q_k)$ must be converging to a $p \in \mathcal{P}(x, q)$ (in the terminology of multifunctions, $(x, q) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(x, q)$ is outer hemi-continuous on $\mathcal{K}$).

REFERENCES

As a simple consequence of the fact that the set (26) is compact whenever C is a compact subset of $\{u > -\infty\}$, we obtain that it is *never* enough to use such a set C to span all arbitrage-free prices using marginal utility-based prices: indeed the convex set $\mathcal{P}$ is relatively open (this follows from Lemma 3 and the definition of $\mathcal{L}$), so it cannot be compact. We shall now see that, even if to recover all arbitrage-free prices one cannot in general avoid points (x, q) on the boundary of $\{u > -\infty\}$ (and one can never stay at a fixed distance away from the boundary of $\{u > -\infty\}$) we can restrict considerably the set of points (x, q) which are needed.

Remark 11 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 for every $s < w(\infty)$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\bigcup_{(x,q) \in (\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}): |(x,q)| < \varepsilon, u(x,q) > -\infty} \mathcal{P}(x, q; U) = \mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{(x,q) \in (\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}): u(x,q) > s} \mathcal{P}(x, q; U).$$

PROOF We recall that assumption (13) is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}$ being open (see [HK04, Lemma 7]), i.e., to the fact that the affine hull of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$, i.e., the set $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$, equals $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. For now, let us assume (13). Define the function $d : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ as

$$d(x, w) := \sup\{|v| : v \in \bar{\mathcal{K}} \text{ and } vw \leq x\}, \quad (28)$$

where vw denotes the dot product between the vectors v and w and $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then, for every $x > 0$, $d(x, w) = xd(1, w)$, and so Lemma 3 implies that $d(x, w)$ is finite if and only if $w \in \mathcal{L}$. Now let p be an arbitrage-free price, so that $d(1, (1, p)) < \infty$. Let $x > 0$ be such that $xd(1, (1, p)) < \varepsilon$, and let (x', q') be a maximizer of the upper-semi-continuous function u on the compact set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$. Then $p \in \mathcal{P}(x', q'; U)$ and $|(x', q')| \leq xd(1, (1, p)) < \varepsilon$, which proves the first equality. When (13) is not assumed, it is easy to prove that u has the same value at the generic $(x, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and at its orthogonal projection onto $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$. Moreover in this case Lemma 3 can be refined as to show that p is an arbitrage-free price if and only if $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x) \cap (\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}})$ is bounded. Thus we can apply the previous proof using the utility u restricted to the set $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$, and get the thesis.

To prove the second equality, let x be big enough that $w(x) > s$, and let (x', q') be a maximizer of the upper-semi-continuous function u on the compact set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(x)$. Then $p \in \mathcal{P}(x', q'; U)$ and $u(x', q') \geq u(x, 0) = w(x) > s$. Since, as before, we can choose such an (x', q') in $\bar{\mathcal{L}} - \bar{\mathcal{L}}$, this concludes the proof. $\square$

References

- [Ber03] Dimitri P. Bertsekas. *Convex analysis and optimization*. Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA, 2003. With Angelia Nedić and Asuman E. Ozdaglar.
- [BV04] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

-
- [Dav97] Mark H. A. Davis. Option pricing in incomplete markets. In *Mathematics of derivative securities (Cambridge, 1995)*, volume 15 of *Publ. Newton Inst.*, pages 216–226. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [DS94] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing. *Math. Ann.*, 300(3):463–520, 1994.
- [DS95] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. The no-arbitrage property under a change of numéraire. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 53(3-4):213–226, 1995.
- [DS97] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. The Banach space of workable contingent claims in arbitrage theory. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 33(1):113–144, 1997.
- [DS98] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes. *Math. Ann.*, 312(2):215–250, 1998.
- [Fol00] Lucien Foldes. Valuation and martingale properties of shadow prices: an exposition. *J. Econom. Dynam. Control*, 24(11-12):1641–1701, 2000. Computational aspects of complex securities.
- [Fri00] Marco Frittelli. Introduction to a theory of value coherent with the no-arbitrage principle. *Finance Stoch.*, 4(3):275–297, 2000.
- [Hic56] Sir J. R. Hicks. *A Revision of Demand Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1956.
- [HK04] Julien Hugonnier and Dmitry Kramkov. Optimal investment with random endowments in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(2):845–864, 2004.
- [HKS05] Julien Hugonnier, Dmitry Kramkov, and Walter Schachermayer. On utility-based pricing of contingent claims in incomplete markets. *Math. Finance*, 15(2):203–212, 2005.
- [HN89] S.D. Hodges and A. Neuberger. Optimal replication of contingent claims under transaction costs. *The Review of Futures Markets*, 8:222–239, 1989.
- [Kal02] Jan Kallsen. Derivative pricing based on local utility maximization. *Finance Stoch.*, 6(1):115–140, 2002.
- [KK96] Ioannis Karatzas and S. G. Kou. On the pricing of contingent claims under constraints. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 6(2):321–369, 1996.
- [KS99] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 9(3):904–950, 1999.

REFERENCES

- [KS03] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. Necessary and sufficient conditions in the problem of optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 13(4):1504–1516, 2003.
- [KS06] Dmitry Kramkov and Mihai Sîrbu. Sensitivity analysis of utility-based prices and risk-tolerance wealth processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(4):2140–2194, 2006.
- [Roc70] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.